DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 713 HE 034 836

TITLE	Initiation Rites and Athletics: A National Survey of NCAA Sports Teams. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Alfred Univ., NY.
PUB DATE	1999-08-00
NOTE	41p.; Funded by the Riedman Insurance Co., Inc.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Athletes; *College Athletics; *College Students; *Hazing; Higher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Initiation Rites

ABSTRACT

Alfred University conducted a national survey of college athletes, coaches, and staff members at National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) institutions early in 1999 to determine the extent of hazing and initiation rites. A national random sample of 10,000 athletes was taken from a composite list of all athletes from 224 NCAA institutions that volunteered for the study. Response rates were 20 to 30%, and results for athletes are based on 2,027 respondents. Results suggest that more than a quarter of a million athletes experienced some form of hazing to join a college athletic team, and one in five was subjected to unacceptable and potentially illegal hazing, including being forced to participate in crimes. Half were required to participate in drinking or alcohol-related hazing, and two in five consumed alcohol on recruitment visits even before enrolling. Two-thirds were subjected to humiliating hazing. Only one in five participated exclusively in positive initiations, such as team trips or ropes courses. Men were more at risk of hazing than women, and hazing was more likely to occur in eastern or southern states with no anti-hazing laws. Such campuses were likely to be rural and residential, with Greek social systems. Athletes, coaches, athletic directors, and college administrators agreed on the need for clear anti-hazing policies and the necessity of communicating expectations for responsibility, integrity, and civility. It is suggested that team-building initiation rites be offered, facilitated by trained coaches or other adults. The first appendix contains some extended response survey replies. The second contains data tables, and the third discusses study methodology. (Contains 26 tables.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 463 713

Alfred University

INITIATION RITES AND ATHLETICS: A National Survey of NCAA Sports Teams

FINAL REPORT

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Goetschius

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Published by Alfred University
Alfred, NY 14802
Funded by the Riedman Insurance Co., Inc.

August 1999

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE035830

Contents

ii Participating and Supporting Institutions

1 Executive Summary

2 Introduction

3 What are Initiation Rites? What is hazing?

7 How Many Athletes are Hazed?

11 Who is Most at Risk? Where are the Hot Spots?

16 How Do We Stop Hazing?

17 Recommendations

Appendices

18 Extended Qualitative Responses

24 Data Tables on Athletes Most at Risk

30 Methodology

Participating and Supporting Institutions

We appreciate the support of colleges and universities across the country: Two hundred twenty four participating institutions (in plain text below) submitted names and addresses of 61,258 student athletes. An additional 120 supporting institutions (in italics below) made efforts to submit names and addresses of student athletes , but were not able to meet the January deadline.

Division I Schools

Arizona State University
Ball State University
Bowling Green State
Brown University
Bucknell University
Butler University
California State University Sacramento
Campbell University
Centenary College of Louisiana
Central Connecticut State University
Colgate University
College of Charleston
College of the Holly Cross
Columbia University
Delaware State University
Drake University
East Carolina University
East Tennessee State University
Eastern Washington University
Florida Atlantic University
Fordham University
George Mason University
Gonzaga University
Idaho State University
Idaho University
Jackson State University
Jacksonville University
Kent State University
La Salle University
Loyola Marymount University
New Mexico State University
Niagara University
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
Ohio University
Piedmont College
Radford University
Saint Bonaventure University
Saint Francis College, Pennsylvania
Samford University
Santa Clara University
Southern Methodist University
Southern Utah University
Syracuse University
Troy State University
University of California - Irvine
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Delaware
University of Denver
University of Georgia
University of Hartford
University of Idaho
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland
University of Montana
University of Nevada, Reno
University of New Hampshire
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina Asheville
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
University of Northern Iowa
University of Notre Dame
University of Portland
University of Rhode Island
University of Richmond
University of San Francisco
University of Southern California
University of Southern Mississippi
University of Southwestern Louisiana
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Tennessee at Martin
University of Texas - Pan American
University of Texas at El Paso
University of Virginia
University of Wyoming
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Valparaiso University
Vanderbilt University
Wagner College
Wake Forest University
Washington State University
Western Kentucky University
Western Michigan University
Wofford College
Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Youngston State University

Division II Schools

Assumption College
Augusta State University
Augustana College, South Dakota
Bellarmine College
Bemidji State University
Bentley College
Brigham Young University Hawaii Campus
Caldwell College
California University Pennsylvania
Central Missouri State University
Central Washington University
Chaminade University
Christian Brothers University
Clarion University
Coker College
Colorado Christian University
Converse College
Davis & Elkins College
Delta State University
Dominican College
Elizabeth City State University
Emporia State University
Fairmont State College
Gannon University
Georgia College & State University
Glenville State College
Humboldt State University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Kennesaw State University
Kentucky Wesleyan College
Kutztowa University
Lake Superior State University
Lees-McRae College
Lenoir-Rhyne College
Limestone College
Lock Haven University
Longwood College
Lynn University
Mercyhurst College
Merrimack College
Michigan Technical University
Millersville University
Mississippi University for Woman
Molloy College
Montana State University - Billings
Newberry College
North Carolina Central University
North Dakota State University
Northern Kentucky University
Northern State University
Nova Southeastern University
Oklahoma Panhandle State University
Ouachita Baptist University
Pace University
Pfeiffer University
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science
Pittsburgh State University
Presbyterian College
Queens College
Quincy University
Rollins College
Sacred Heart University
Saint Joseph College, Connecticut
Saint Leo College
Saint Martin's College
Saint Michael's College
San Francisco State University
Schreiner College
Shippensburg University
Slippery Rock University
South Dakota State University
South West State University
Southern Arkansas University
Southwest Baptist University
St. Edward's University
St. Mary's University, Texas
State University of West Georgia
Teikyo Post University

Continued on next page

Division II Schools *Continued*

Texas Lutheran University
Texas Woman's University
The College of Saint Rose
University of Alabama Huntsville
University of Central Arkansas
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
University of Missouri St. Louis
University of Northern Colorado
University of Puerto Rico Humaceo
University of Saint Francis
University of South Carolina Aiken
University of South Colorado
University of South Dakota
Valdosta State University
Virginia State University
Wayne State University
West Chester University
West Texas A & M University
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Western Oregon University
Wheeling Jesuit University
Wingate University

Division III Schools

Albertus Magnus College
Albion College
Alfred University
Anna Maria College
Augustana College, Illinois
Austin College
Bard College
Bates College
Bay Path College
Bethany College
Blackburn College
Bowdoin College
Brandeis University
Bridgewater College
Brooklyn College
Buena Vista University
Buffalo State College
Cabrini College
California State Hayward
Calvin College
Carrol College
Carthage College
Case Western Reserve University
Cazenovia College
Central College
Centre College
Chatham College
Chowan College
Clarkson University
Colby-Sawyer College
College Misericordia
College of New Jersey
2College of Staten Island
Concorda University
Defiance College
Delaware Valley College
Denison University
DePauw University
Eastern College
Eastern Connecticut State University
Eastern Mennonite University
Elmhurst College
Emerson College
Emory University
Evergreen State College
Fitchburg State College
Franklin and Marshall College
Gallaudet University
Gettysburg College
Goucher College
Greensboro College
Greenville College
Grinnell College
Hampden-Sydney College
Heidelberg College
Hendrix College
Hilbert College
Hobart and William Smith College
Hobart College
Illinois Wesleyan University
John Jay College
Juniata College
Kean University
Keuka College
La Grange College
Lake Forest College
Lewis-Clark State College
Lincoln University
Linfield College
Loras College
Luther College
Mac Murray College
Macalester College
Maine Maritime Academy
Maranatha Baptist Bible College
Marietta College
Mary Baldwin College
Mary Washington College
Maryville University of St. Louis
Marywood University
Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts
McMurry University
Medaille College
Mesa State College
Messiah College
Middlebury College
Nazareth College
Nazareth College
Nebraska Wesleyan University
New Jersey City University
North Carolina Wesleyan College
Northland College
Norwich University
Oberlin College
Oglethorpe University
Otterbein College
Pennsylvania State University at Erie-Behrend College
Pine Manor College
Plymouth State College
Principia College
Ramapo College of New Jersey
Randolph-Macon College
Randolph-Macon Woman's College
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Rhode Island College
Roanoke College
Rockford College
Roger Williams University
Rowan University
Salisbury State University
Salve Regina University
Skidmore College
Southern Vermont College
Southwestern University
Springfield College
St. John Fisher College
St. Joseph's College, Maine
St. Lawrence University
State University of New York College at Brockport
State University of New York College at Cortland
State University of New York College at Geneseo
State University of New York Institute of Technology at Utica-Rome
Sul Ross State University
Susquehanna University
Sweet Briar College
The College of New Jersey
The Sage Colleges
The University of the South
Tufts University
Union College
University of California-Santa Cruz
University of Mass Boston
University of Mass Dartmouth
University of Pittsburgh at Bradford
University of Pittsburgh Greensburg Campus
University of Redlands
University of Scranton
University of Southern Maine
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
University of Wisconsin-Stout
University of Wisconsin-Superior
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
University of Wittenberg
Upper Iowa University
Ursinus College
Vassar College
Wartburg College
Washington and Lee University
Washington College
Washington University
Waynesburg College
Webster University
Wesley College
Westfield State College
Wheaton College, Massachusetts
Whitman College
Whittier College
Whitworth College
Wittenberg University
Worcester State College
York College of Pennsylvania

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over 325,000 athletes at more than 1,000 National Collegiate Athletic Association schools participated in intercollegiate sports during 1998-99. Of these athletes:

- ***More than a quarter of a million*** (250,000+) experienced some form of hazing to join a college athletic team.
- ***One in five*** was subjected to unacceptable and potentially illegal hazing. They were kidnapped, beaten or tied up and abandoned. They were also forced to commit crimes – destroying property, making prank phone calls or harassing others.
- ***Half*** were required to participate in drinking contests or alcohol-related hazing.
- ***Two in five*** consumed alcohol on recruitment visits even before enrolling.
- ***Two- thirds*** were subjected to humiliating hazing, such as being yelled or sworn at, forced to wear embarrassing clothing or forced to deprive oneself of sleep, food or personal hygiene.
- ***Only one in five*** participated exclusively in positive initiations, such as team trips or ropes courses.

Athletes most at risk for any kind of hazing for college sports were men; non-Greek members; and either swimmers, divers, soccer players, or lacrosse players. The campuses where hazing was most likely to occur were primarily in eastern or southern states with no anti-hazing laws. The campuses were rural, residential, and had Greek systems.

- ***Women were more likely*** to be involved in alcohol-related hazing than in other forms of hazing.
- ***Football players were most at risk*** for dangerous and potentially illegal hazing.
- ***Non-Greeks were most at risk of being hazed for athletics,*** even though a Greek system on campus is a significant predictor of hazing.
- ***Eastern and western campuses*** had the most alcohol-related hazing.
- ***Southern and midwestern campuses*** had the greatest incidence of dangerous and potentially illegal hazing.

Athletes, coaches, athletic directors and college administrators agreed on strategies to prevent hazing:

- ***Send a clear anti-hazing message*** in policy, education, and enforcement.
- ***Expect responsibility, integrity, and civility*** on the part of athletes, team captains, coaches, and administrators.
- ***Offer team-building initiation rites*** facilitated by trained coaches or other adults.

INTRODUCTION

Alfred University conducted a national survey of college athletes, coaches and staff members at National Collegiate Athletic Association institutions early in 1999.[1] The Riedman Insurance Co., Inc., Rochester, NY, underwrote the study. The cooperation of the NCAA was crucial to the success of the effort.

This study established a baseline of information on hazing in intercollegiate athletics. It included all NCAA divisions for both male and female sports. The study sought to identify:

- The scope of initiation rites in college athletics.
- Perceptions of what is appropriate or inappropriate.
- Strategies to prevent hazing.

The method of study was a direct mail survey that guaranteed anonymity. Two nearly identical surveys were used: one for athletes, a second for coaches and administrators. All NCAA athletic directors and senior student affairs officers were surveyed. A national random sample of 3,000 NCAA coaches was taken from a list of coaches registered at Intercollegiate Directories, Inc. A national random sample of 10,000 athletes was taken from a composite list of all athletes from 224 NCAA institutions that volunteered for this study. Response rates were 20-30 percent. Results for athletes are based on 2,027 respondents. Survey results were optically scanned into a database and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics: frequencies, percentages, chi-square tests, regression analysis, and factor analysis. For a full description of methodology and analysis see the web site: *www.alfred.edu/news/html/hazing_study.html*

Throughout the course of the study, we relied on assistance and encouragement from our national advisers and reviewers: Bridget Belgiovine, assistant chief of staff for Division III of the NCAA; Todd Petr, director of research for the NCAA; Hank Nuwer, author of Wrongs of Passage and adjunct professor of journalism at Indiana University-Indianapolis; and Eileen Stevens, national anti-hazing advocate.

This report was developed to share the findings with the institutions that expressed their concern for student health and safety by supporting Alfred University in this study. We also hope this report will raise the awareness of the general public in the United States about the prevalence and nature of this problem.

---

[1] *(EDITOR'S NOTE: As a result of a hazing incident at Alfred University in the fall of 1998, President Edward G. Coll, Jr., created an investigatory commission. The Commission suspected that hazing to join athletic teams was pervasive on the nation's campuses. No empirical data could be found, however, prompting the Commission to recommend that Alfred undertake a national baseline study of this issue. For more information, contact Alfred University Director of Communications Susan C. Goetschius, One Saxon Drive, Alfred, NY 14802-1205, 607-871-2170, e-mail: goetschius@king.alfred.edu, or check the website: www.alfred.edu/news/html/hazing_study.html)*

WHAT ARE INITIATION RITES? WHAT IS HAZING?

Across societies and time, people have initiated new members into groups, through ceremonies and rituals designed to foster a feeling of belonging. Yet sometimes those rites or activities cross the line into hazing – behavior that is humiliating, dangerous or even illegal. Because people's perceptions of hazing vary, it is difficult to delineate positive or acceptable initiation rites from questionable or unacceptable ones.

We defined hazing as "**any activity expected of someone joining a group that humiliates, degrades, abuses or endangers, regardless of the person's willingness to participate. This does not include activities such as rookies carrying the balls, team parties with community games, or going out with your teammates, unless an atmosphere of humiliation, degradation, abuse or danger arises.**"[2] This definition was printed clearly at the beginning of our survey forms.

Under this definition, 45 percent of the respondents reported that they knew of, had heard of, or suspected hazing on their campuses. Only 12 percent reported being hazed for athletics. Eighty percent, however, reported being subjected to one or more typical hazing behaviors as part of their team initiations. So, while students would acknowledge a wide range of hazing-type behaviors, they most often were reluctant to label them "hazing." This reluctance is understandable, particularly considering that hazing is a crime in 41 states.

The following tables display the athletes' reports of initiation behaviors, divided into four mutually exclusive categories:

- *acceptable* behaviors (only positive activities)
- *questionable* behaviors (humiliating or degrading activities, but no dangerous or potentially illegal, activities)
- *alcohol-related activities* (drinking contests, exclusive of other dangerous or potentially illegal activities)
- *unacceptable and potentially illegal behaviors* (activities that carry a high probability of danger or injury, or could result in criminal charges).

The prevalence of hazing became far clearer when we looked at component behaviors. One hundred percent of athletes responding to the survey were involved in some form of initiation onto their athletic teams. Nearly all were expected to participate in *acceptable* behaviors. However, 80 percent were also subjected to other forms of initiation that are *questionable, alcohol-related*, or *unacceptable*.

---

[2] Many of the 41 states with anti-hazing laws limit their definition of hazing, often eliminating humiliation as an element. Many of the laws are specifically targeted to fraternity hazing, and do not cover athletic or high school hazing. State laws also vary on whether or not consent of the person hazed is included in the definition of hazing. (Source: Hank Nuwer)

Twenty percent reported being involved in ONLY *acceptable* initiation activities. Even though athletes must perform to specific standards (skill level, performance in a sport or maintaining a specific GPA) in order to qualify for a team, the prevalence of hazing behaviors suggests that such *acceptable* activities are not enough. Athletes seem to need activities specifically designed for initiation, and if those are not provided, they will create their own.

Percentage of Athletes Participating in *Acceptable* Initiation Activities

***Acceptable* Initiation Activities**	**Male 877**	**(n)**	**Female (n) 1142**		**Total 2027**	**(n)**
Attending pre-season training	89%	728	89%	983	88%	1716
Testing for skill, endurance, or performance in a sport	78%	678	78%	859	79%	1540
Keeping a specific grade point average	72%	612	78%	861	75%	1478
Dressing up for team functions (besides uniforms)	69%	591	75%	843	73%	1438
Attending a skit night or team roast	54%	457	57%	632	55%	1092
Doing volunteer community service	45%	383	54%	601	50%	987
Taking an oath or signing a contract of standards	44%	380	54%	602	50%	985
Completing a ropes course or team trip	29%	252	43%	475	37%	729
Total of athletes involved in at least one *acceptable* activity	**96%**	**838**	**97%**	**1102**	**96%**	**1945**

Female athletes were significantly more likely to be involved exclusively in *acceptable* initiation activities and male athletes were significantly more likely to be involved in hazing behaviors. Still, as the tables below show, hazing was nearly as common among women as men.

Percentage of Athletes Participating in *Questionable* Initiation Activities

***Questionable* Initiation Activities**	**Male**	**(n)**	**Female (n)**		**Total**	**(n)**
Being yelled, cursed, or sworn at	38%	326	25%	286	31%	614
Being forced to wear embarrassing clothing	22%	194	33%	373	29%	571
Tattooing, piercing, head shaving, or branding	32%	278	24%	272	28%	552
Participating in calisthenics not related to a sport	14%	125	11%	127	13%	253
Associating with specific people, not others	12%	101	11%	124	11%	226
Acting as personal servant to players off the field, court	10%	85	8%	95	9%	181
Being forced to deprive oneself of food, sleep or hygiene	7%	56	8%	85	7%	141
Consuming extremely spicy/disgusting concoctions	8%	69	5%	60	6%	129
Total involved in at least one *questionable* activity	**68%**	**594**	**63%**	**719**	**65%**	**1318**

The odds are high that a team that engages in *questionable* initiation activities will also engage in *unacceptable* activities. Although seemingly harmless, *questionable* activities are often a warning sign of more dangerous and destructive behavior. Over 80 percent of the athletes who were subjected to *questionable* initiation activities were also subjected to *unacceptable* activities. Dismissing *questionable* initiation activities as harmless is a common response, but by doing so, we may be ignoring more serious problems.

Percentage of Athletes Engaged in *Questionable* Activities Who Participated in At Least One *Unacceptable* Act

***Questionable* Activities**	**%**
Being yelled, cursed, or sworn at	81%
Tattooing, piercing, head shaving, or branding	81%
Being forced to wear embarrassing clothing	85%
Participating in calisthenics not related to a sport	98%
Associating with specific people, not others	98%
Being forced to deprive oneself of food, sleep or hygiene	99%
Acting as personal servant to players off the field, court	100%
Consuming extremely spicy/disgusting concoctions	100%

We know that many hazing deaths involve alcohol, either because students' judgement is impaired and they take risks they would not otherwise take, or because they overdose on alcohol. Respondents confirm that alcohol plays a major role in hazing to join athletic teams, with more than half of the athletes saying they were involved in *alcohol-related* initiation activities.

Percentage of Athletes Participating in *Alcohol-Related* Initiation Activities[3]

Alcohol-related Initiation Activities	**Male**	**(n)**	**Female**	**(n)**	**Total**	**(n)**
Consuming alcohol on recruitment visits	42%	364	39%	442	42%	809
Participating in a drinking contest	35%	302	34%	387	35%	693
Total involved in any alcohol-related activity	**52%**	**456**	**51%**	**582**	**51%**	**1042**

One out of every five athletes (27 percent of men, 16 percent of women) participated in one or more *unacceptable* initiation rites, those that carry a high probability of danger or injury, or could result in criminal charges.

Percentage of Athletes Participating in *Unacceptable* Initiation Activities

Other *Unacceptable* Initiation Activities	**Male**	**(n)**	**Female**	**(n)**	**Total**	**(n)**
Making prank calls or harassing others	12%	105	8%	91	10%	197
Destroying or stealing property	11%	91	5%	59	7%	150
Engaging in or simulating sexual acts	7%	64	5%	52	6%	116
Being tied up, taped, or confined in small space	8%	65	3%	29	5%	94
Being paddled, whipped, beaten, kicked; beating others	5%	42	1%	13	3%	55
Being kidnapped or transported and abandoned	4%	33	2%	19	3%	52
Total involved any one *unacceptable* activity	**27%**	**234**	**16%**	**183**	**21%**	**418**

[3]It should be noted that many athletes participating in alcohol-related initiation activities are under the legal drinking age of 21. In such instances, alcohol-related initiation rites are illegal.

For 17 percent of the respondents, however, initiation goes beyond a single infraction. These athletes – overwhelmingly men – found themselves deeply immersed in a culture of hazing. They participated in or were subjected to five or more hazing behaviors. Factor analysis reported six distinct clusters of related behaviors. Further study into this clustering phenomenon, in which subcultures of hazing behavior seem to emerge, may offer insights into detection and prevention strategies.[4]

[4] A more complete discussion of the factor analysis that defines the hazing culture subgroups is found on the website: http://www.alfred.edu/news/html/hazing_study.html

How Many Athletes Are Hazed?

On the basis of their reported behaviors and activities, approximately 80 percent of the respondents were subjected to *questionable* or *unacceptable* activities as part of their initiation onto a collegiate athletics team. When this figure is projected to the national population, over a quarter of a million athletes – about 255,637 – were hazed.[5]

With all the possible interrelated combinations of acts, four mutually exclusive groups of students were defined based on the general seriousness of their activities:

- 21 percent were involved in non-alcohol-related, *unacceptable* activities
- Another 39 percent were involved in *alcohol-related* activities
- 19 percent were involved in *questionable* activities
- Only 19 percent were involved exclusively in *acceptable* activities

Distribution of Athletes by the Severity of Collegiate Athletic Initiation

Activities	%	Estimated N
Acceptable initiation activities only	19%	61,888 athletes nationally
Questionable initiation rites, no unacceptable activities	19%	61,342 athletes nationally
Alcohol-related initiation; no other unacceptable activities	39%	126,254 athletes nationally
Unacceptable initiation activities, other than alcohol-related	21%	68,041 athletes nationally
Hazed *(total of questionable, alcohol, & other unacceptable)*	**79%**	**255,637 athletes nationally**

Based on this analysis:

- One in five athletes was ***acceptably*** initiated.
- One in five athletes was ***questionably*** initiated.
- Three in five athletes were ***unacceptably*** initiated.

Additionally, 42 percent – a figure that projects to about 136,160 nationally – of the athletes surveyed reported consuming alcohol on recruitment visits. Campus visits are often the first step of new students' initiation onto a college team. Thus, for many athletes, hazing actually begins while they are in high school with underage drinking with their prospective college teammates.

Moreover, half of all athletes surveyed (49 percent) reported consuming alcohol during team initiation activities after matriculation. This number includes drinking contests or any other *questionable* or *unacceptable* activities done while consuming alcohol. Approximately 158,823 athletes nationally were expected to participate in drinking contests as part of their initiation onto a collegiate athletics team.

---

[5] To obtain estimated numbers (prevalence), we weighted our survey sample of 2,027 respondents by gender and division. Using NCAA participation rates from the *NCAA Participation Study 1996-97 (1998)*, for gender and NCAA division, we divided the number of survey respondents in each category of gender by division to obtain the numbers to weight the sample.

Grouping of Athletes Involved in *Alcohol-Related* Initiation

Activities	%	Estimated N
Alcohol on Recruitment	42%	136,160 athletes nationally
Drinking Contests	49%	158,823 athletes nationally

As noted previously, there was a marked difference between the number of athletes who reported being hazed to join a college team, and in the type of behavior they reported. For that reason, we found it more useful to examine the reported behaviors in order to estimate how many college athletes were hazed to join teams. There were, however, some significant issues raised by respondents who acknowledged that they were hazed.

Many athletes were introduced to *questionable* initiation rites ***prior*** to college. Respondents were asked the age at which they were first hazed. Of those athletes who reported they were hazed in college, 42 percent reported that they had also been hazed in high school and 5 percent said they were hazed in middle school. Since far more athletes reported hazing behaviors than those who said they were actually hazed, the incidence of hazing behavior among high school and middle school students may also be much higher than these figures suggest. This finding requires further study. According to research reported in High School Hazing by Hank Nuwer (Franklin Watts/Grolier forthcoming), the majority of high school hazing incidents severe or objectionable enough to merit newspaper coverage are connected to hazing in high school athletic teams or cheerleading squads.

Younger athletes seem to be notably desensitized to hazing. The majority of students undergoing these experiences, the freshmen and sophomores, often do not acknowledge they were hazed. Juniors and seniors were significantly more likely to report hazing incidents, many of which occurred when they were 18 or younger.

Many athletes wrote comments on their response forms. Some said hazing does not exist on their campuses, or that it is a "non-issue." Others acknowledged hazing, but resisted efforts to stop it, saying it is "part of team chemistry," or a "tradition." One student wrote, "If no one is hurt to the point where they need medical attention, just leave it alone. All the kids get accepted when it's over... 90 percent of the time, it's a one-time deal and it's over. Leave it alone."

Coaches and administrators[6] seemed aware of the positive initiation activities, and unaware of the prevalence of hazing and alcohol use. Only 10 percent of the coaches reported that they knew of any hazing on their campuses. Fewer than 10 percent of the coaches and administrators reported knowing about alcohol consumption for team initiation.

[6] Administrators include athletic directors and senior student affairs officers. For ease in reporting, the senior student affairs officers are designated as deans in the tables.

Percentage of Respondents Who Knew of *Acceptable* Initiations

***Acceptable* Initiation Activities**	**Athletes n=2027**	**Coaches n=1049**	**Ath. Dir. n=338**	**Deans n=235**
Attending pre-season training	88%	82%	82%	74%
Tests for skill, endurance, or performance in a sport	79%	75%	80%	68%
Keeping a specific grade point average	75%	69%	68%	67%
Dressing up for team functions (besides uniforms)	73%	68%	58%	47%
Attending a skit night or team roast	55%	31%	34%	14%
Doing volunteer community service	50%	73%	79%	59%
Taking an oath or signing a contract of standards	50%	40%	45%	26%
Completing a ropes course or team trip	37%	45%	52%	26%

Percentage of Respondents Who Knew of *Questionable/ Unacceptable* Initiations

***Questionable* Initiation Activities**	**Athletes**	**Coaches**	**Ath. Dir.**	**Deans**
	n=2027	**n=1049**	**n=338**	**n=235**
Yelling, cursing, or swearing	31%	12%	10%	16%
Wearing embarrassing clothing	29%	12%	11%	11%
Tattooing, piercing, head shaving, or branding	28%	15%	16%	16%
Participating in calisthenics not related to a sport	13%	3%	3%	3%
Associating with specific people, not others	11%	2%	3%	6%
Acting as personal servant to players off the field, court	9%	3%	2%	3%
Depriving oneself of food, sleep or hygiene	7%	1%	1%	2%
Consuming extremely spicy/disgusting concoctions	6%	0%	0%	1%
***Alcohol-related* Initiation Activities**				
Consuming alcohol on recruitment visits	42%	7%	5%	9%
Participating in a drinking contest	35%	4%	4%	8%
Other *Unacceptable* Initiation Activities				
Making prank calls or harassing others	10%	0%	1%	3%
Destroying or stealing property	7%	2%	3%	3%
Engaging in or simulating sexual acts	6%	1%	0%	2%
Being tied up, taped, or confined in small space	5%	2%	1%	0%
Paddling, whipping, beating, kicking, beating others	3%	1%	1%	0%
Kidnapping or transporting and abandoning	3%	1%	1%	0%

Several athletic directors and coaches denied the need to discuss hazing or its prevention. In their written responses, they made comments such as: "This is a non-issue! It doesn't happen here;" "... this is one of the more ridiculous questionnaires I've ever been asked to complete;" "...(hazing) has never come up at any meeting in student life committee. If it happened, it would be an isolated case."

Some administrators were concerned about singling out athletes from the rest of the student body. Others took legalistic approaches, such as one senior student affairs officer who wrote: "Please note that the athletic department has no special policies and procedures for hazing. Should this happen, we would follow university policies and procedures. The university, through policies and student affairs

regulations, enforces hazing prevention. Problems of and discipline for hazing is handled by upper administration, the same as all students."

Another frequent comment from athletic directors and coaches was that they perceive hazing is a problem for fraternities and sororities, but not for athletics.

All respondent groups agree that hazing is highly secretive. As one coach put it: "The rules as they are now are good rules. The problem is that we know hazing occurs but we have no proof. No one will come forward so it is not punished. You can't enforce a rule based on hearsay."

Athletes' Reporting of Hazing versus Coaches' and Administrators' Perceptions of Most Students' Reporting of Hazing

Student Reporting of Hazing	Athletes n=2027	Coaches n=1049	Ath.Dir. n=338	Deans n=235
Would you, or most of your students, report hazing? No=>	60%	52%	54%	71%
If not, why not? *(check all that apply)*				
It's not a problem; sometimes accidents happen	48%	26%	26%	37%
I just wouldn't tell on my friends, no matter what	26%	30%	36%	54%
Administration wouldn't handle it right & make it worse	26%	7%	7%	11%
Not comfortable talking to coach or AD, no one else to tell	6%	7%	11%	11%
Teammates would make my life so miserable, I'd have to leave school	4%	6%	6%	17%

Sixty percent of the athletes said they would not report hazing. Coaches believed that more students would report such incidents, and student affairs officers expected that fewer would report them. Students' reasons for silence were different from the reasons coaches and administrators expected them to give.

WHO IS MOST AT RISK? WHERE ARE THE HOT SPOTS?

Every athlete was at risk of being hazed. Some athletes, however, were at higher risk than were others. Using chi-square analysis, we determined at a confidence level of 99% the athletes most at risk of being hazed to join a team. They were:

- Male
- Non-Greek
- Swimmers or divers
- Soccer players
- Lacrosse players
- In the east or south
- On a rural campus
- On a residential campus
- On a campus with a Greek system
- In a state with no anti-hazing law

Having learned, in general, which athletes were most likely to be hazed, we then analyzed the risk by category of athletes. The results are:

TYPE OF BEHAVIOR: Earlier in this report, we divided initiation behaviors into four groups based on severity. Below we describe which athletes were most at risk at each level of severity.

***Unacceptable* Initiation:** Athletes most at risk of being subjected to *unacceptable* initiation activities, regardless of the involvement of alcohol, were:
- men
- swimmers, divers, football players or water polo players
- students at southern or midwestern institutions

Alcohol-Related* Initiation:** Athletes most at risk of being subjected to *alcohol-related* initiation, ***but not other *unacceptable* initiation activities, were:
- women[7]
- lacrosse players
- students at eastern or western residential institutions

***Questionable* Initiation:** Athletes most at risk of being subjected to *questionable*, but not *unacceptable*, initiation activities were:
- football players
- students at campuses in the south or west.

***Acceptable* Initiation:** Athletes most likely to be involved in only *acceptable* initiation were:
- women
- members of a Greek organization
- members of track, fencing, or tennis teams;
- students at midwestern or western urban, commuter campuses.

[7] While there were fewer women overall involved in hazing activities, if women did participate in hazing, it was more likely to be alcohol-related.

Different profiles emerge as we look closer at athletes who are involved *in alcohol-related* initiations, specifically alcohol on recruitment visits and drinking contests, regardless of their involvement in other types of behavior.

Alcohol on Recruitment: Athletes most at risk of consuming alcohol on recruitment were:
- Division I scholarship athletes
- members of swimming, diving, lacrosse, football, or soccer teams
- students at rural, residential campuses in eastern states without anti-hazing laws

Drinking Contests for Athletic Team Initiation: Athletes most at risk of being subjected to drinking contests for team initiation were:
- swimmers, divers, lacrosse players, or hockey players
- students at eastern, rural, residential campuses in states with no anti-hazing law.

SEX: There were clear differences in the way men and women initiate new members onto an athletic team.

Women were more likely than men to be involved in *acceptable* initiation activities: participating in preseason practice, taking oaths, keeping a higher GPA, doing volunteer work, completing a ropes course, dressing up for team functions and participating in other team-building activities. The ropes course (a professionally designed outdoors challenge course) or team trip demonstrates the biggest contrast: 43 percent of the women as opposed to 29 percent of the men.

Women were as likely or nearly as likely to participate in some initiation activities as men, as shown on the table below.

Initiation Activities with Comparable Male/Female Participation Rates

Initiation Activities	Male	n	Female	n	Total	n
Participating in calisthenics not related to a sport	14%	125	11%	127	13%	253
Associating with specific people, not others	12%	101	11%	124	11%	226
Acting as personal servant to players off the field, court	10%	85	8%	95	9%	181
Depriving oneself of food, sleep or hygiene	7%	56	8%	85	7%	141
Consuming extremely spicy/disgusting concoctions	8%	69	5%	60	6%	129
Participating in drinking contests	35%	302	34%	387	35%	693
Making prank calls or harassing others	12%	105	8%	91	10%	197
Engaging in or simulating sexual acts	7%	64	5%	52	6%	116

For other activities, there are clear differences between men and women. Men are consistently more likely than women to be subjected to any one of the *questionable* or *unacceptable* activities, except wearing embarrassing clothing. Men were notably more likely than women to be yelled, cursed, or sworn at as part of their initiation.

Women were much less likely than men to be subjected to *unacceptable* acts: destroying or stealing property, beating up others, being tied up or taped, being confined in small places, being paddled, beaten, kidnapped or transported and abandoned.

Initiation Activities with Dissimilar Male/Female Participation Rates

Initiation Activities	Male 877	Female 1142	Total 2027
Wearing embarrassing clothing	22%	33%	29%
Being yelled, cursed, or sworn at	38%	25%	31%
Consuming alcohol on recruitment visits	42%	39%	42%
Participating in a drinking contest	35%	34%	35%
Destroying or stealing property	11%	5%	7%
Being tied up, taped, or confined in small space	8%	3%	5%
Being paddled, whipped, beaten, kicked, beating othe	5%	1%	3%
Being kidnapped or transported and abandoned	4%	2%	3%

SPORTS: Swimmers or divers and lacrosse, soccer, football, hockey and water polo players were significantly more likely to be subjected to a greater number of *questionable* and *unacceptable* initiation activities than any other athletes.

Football is the only sport that had a relatively low response rate among athletes. Football players who did respond reported higher levels of hazing behavior for other college groups than for their own collegiate athletic team. Still, football players were more likely to be involved with most of the *unacceptable* initiation activities and the *questionable* activities, but not the *alcohol-related* activities.

Overall, athletes in track, fencing, and golf were significantly less likely to be hazed. In addition, cross-country, basketball, rowing, and tennis were significantly less involved with alcohol and other *unacceptable* activities.

Percentage of Student Athletes by Sport and Initiation Activity	Baseball	Basketball	Cross-Country	Fencing	Football	Golf	Gymnastics	Ice Hockey	Lacrosse	Rifle
Yelled, cursed or sworn at	40	46	24	33	54	33	33	52	43	50
Wearing embarrassing clothing	17	20	30	0	22	12	33	42	52	0
Tattooing, piercing, head shaving or branding	35	25	36	0	46	19	20	33	54	0
Participating in a calisthenics contest not related to a sport	10	11	13	33	18	9	18	10	23	50
Associating with specific people, not others	9	10	16	0	15	20	0	11	21	50
Acting as a personal servant to other players off the field	9	5	7	0	10	9	0	24	15	0
Depriving oneself or food, sleep, or hygiene	7	5	11	0	5	7	10	10	10	0
Consuming extremely hot or disgusting concoctions	10	3	4	0	10	3	9	23	21	50
Participating in a drinking contest	39	38	39	0	42	38	30	71	75	0
Consuming alcohol during recruitment visits	43	45	37	0	68	50	50	72	83	50
Making prank calls or harassing others	16	9	12	0	13	12	0	24	13	0
Destroying or stealing property	11	7	10	0	15	7	0	9	11	0
Engaging in or simulating sexual acts	6	6	8	0	9	7	0	5	9	0
Tied up, taped, or confined in small spaces	6	2	5	0	7	2	0	19	4	0
Paddled, whipped, beaten, kicked or beating up others	2	2	4	0	7	2	0	5	1	0
Kidnapped, transported or abandoned	5	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	1	50

Percentage of Student Athletes by Sport and Initiation Activity	Rowing	Skiing	Soccer	Softball	Swimming/Diving	Tennis	Track	Volleyball	Water Polo	Wrestling
Yelled, cursed or sworn at	21	17	46	40	32	27	28	34	53	41
Wearing embarrassing clothing	38	57	46	39	55	21	28	36	50	20
Tattooing, piercing, head shaving or branding	39	29	41	26	50	27	30	27	38	30
Participating in a calisthenics contest not related to a sport	15	13	15	13	18	13	11	12	0	33
Associating with specific people, not others	17	14	16	18	14	12	15	9	12	13
Acting as a personal servant to other players off the field	2	19	10	12	20	13	7	11	0	9
Depriving oneself or food, sleep, or hygiene	9	0	5	8	11	10	7	10	7	21
Consuming extremely hot or disgusting concoctions	2	13	9	5	16	2	4	3	12	6
Participating in a drinking contest	47	50	51	54	67	33	37	42	67	52
Consuming alcohol during recruitment visits	38	75	61	51	76	38	40	52	54	50
Making prank calls or harassing others	3	6	14	12	17	9	10	9	12	7
Destroying or stealing property	5	7	7	11	16	5	7	8	7	9
Engaging in or simulating sexual acts	2	6	7	5	10	5	5	3	6	6
Tied up, taped, or confined in small spaces	2	0	5	2	15	2	4	2	24	6
Paddled, whipped, beaten, kicked or beating up others	3	0	3	2	3	3	3	1	12	7
Kidnapped, transported or abandoned	2	6	4	2	7	5	1	3	7	0

NCAA DIVISION: NCAA division had no effect on the degree to which hazing was present. The breakdown by division of those who reported involvement in any form of hazing behavior was identical to the breakdown of the general population of NCAA athletes. NCAA Division I athletes and NCAA scholarship athletes were significantly more likely to consume alcohol on recruitment as part of initiation onto a team than Division II, III, or non-scholarship athletes.

NCAA Div.	% hazed	% total population
Division I	41	42
Division II	22	21
Division III	37	37

GREEK AND OTHER CAMPUS ORGANIZATIONS: Although this study does not focus on Greek initiation rites, each athlete was asked if he or she was a member of a Greek organization and if there was a Greek system on campus. Based upon reported behavior, this study found that non-Greek athletes were most at risk for athletic hazing. This study also found that Greek athletes were significantly more likely than non-Greeks to report they had participated in *acceptable* initiation rites exclusively. However, the presence of a Greek system on campus was highly correlated with *questionable* and *unacceptable* initiations among collegiate athletes.

In comparing athletic hazing to hazing by other groups, we relied upon respondents who identified themselves as hazing victims, which is a very small group compared to those who were involved in hazing behavior. Further study is needed to clarify the prevalence of hazing among members of various student groups for various collegiate organizations.

The survey showed that some students were hazed by more than one group. Athletes were asked: 1) if they had ever been hazed for collegiate athletics and 2) if they had ever been hazed for another group. Twenty percent of student athletes reported that they were hazed in college, of whom:

- *12 percent* reported that teammates hazed them.
- *12 percent* reported that members of non-athletic groups hazed them.
- *4 percent* reported that both teammates and members of non-athletic groups hazed them.

Athletes reported being hazed by teammates as often as they reported being hazed by fraternities, sororities or other groups. So even though it has received far less attention, hazing to join college teams may be just as prevalent as hazing is to join other organizations, including fraternities and sororities.

Coaches and administrators ages 20 – 39 were more likely than any other group of respondents to report being hazed to join an athletic team, whereas coaches and administrators ages 40 and older were more likely to report having been hazed by another group. Whether this suggests a long-term trend in hazing behavior is a subject for further study.

GEOGRAPHIC VARIATIONS: *Alcohol-related* hazing was most common on eastern, rural, residential campuses. Athletes involved in only *acceptable* initiation activities were found to be primarily from midwestern and western, urban, commuter campuses. Still, the unacceptable activities were more prevalent on southern or midwestern campuses and the *questionable* activities were more likely to occur on southern or western campuses.

How Do We Stop Hazing?

Athletes were aware of campus policies concerning recruitment and alcohol. Most athletes reported that their institutions had athletic, behavioral, and academic standards guiding athletic recruitment. Seventy-three percent of the athletes thought that their institutions enforced state drinking laws on campus and that their administrations prosecuted alcohol misconduct violations.

Athletes had little or no knowledge, however, of strategies directly related to hazing prevention on their campuses. Only 15 percent believed that their institutions involved law enforcement in monitoring, investigating, and prosecuting hazing incidents. Only 25 percent of athletes thought the institutions had clear staff expectations in athletics for monitoring and enforcing hazing policy. Only a third (36 percent) of athletes believed that the institutions provided alternative bonding and recognition events for teams to prevent hazing. Only 25 percent of athletes thought that their institutions took strong disciplinary and corrective measures for known cases of hazing, yet these were the strategies survey respondents considered most effective in the prevention of hazing.

Respondents' Opinion of the Effectiveness of Specific Strategies to Prevent Hazing

Prevention Strategies Thought Most Effective	Athletes n=2027	%	Coach n=822	%	AthDir n=338	%	Deans n=235	%
Strong disciplinary & corrective measures for known cases	496	52%	343	68%	128	69%	106	68%
Athletic, behavioral, & academic standards guiding recruitment	801	51%	464	61%	170	65%	122	65%
Alternative bonding & recognition events for teams to prevent hazing	482	45%	295	56%	93	56%	56	47%
Law enforcement involved in monitoring, investigating, and prosecuting hazing incidents	289	35%	175	41%	77	55%	58	46%
Clear staff expectations in athletics for monitoring & enforcing	296	31%	286	55%	126	61%	96	68%
Written anti-hazing policy with clearly prescribed consequences	277	27%	187	37%	76	43%	67	45%
Contracts of hazing policies, laws & consequences for athletes to sign	256	27%	112	31%	38	35%	32	34%
Enforcement of state drinking laws on campus/prosecution of misconduct	415	26%	300	39%	124	49%	95	47%
Designated person to whom to report suspected hazing	188	21%	172	36%	73	41%	57	42%
Hazing workshops for athletes, coaches, & athletic administrators	106	15%	104	29%	50	42%	34	37%
Peer anti-hazing activities: peer ed., counseling, team party patrols	106	14%	110	31%	41	38%	35	39%

RECOMMENDATIONS

Athletes, coaches and administrators believed that hazing prevention requires a clear anti-hazing message; an expectation of responsibility, integrity and civility; and structured initiation rites that build teams and encourage bonding.

Send a Clear Anti-Hazing Message:
- Develop a written anti-hazing policy for athletes with clear definitions and consequences.
- Educate the administration, coaching staff and athletes on the policy and definition.
- Develop a contract for student athletes regarding hazing and alcohol consumption.
- Establish a record of taking strong action against suspected and known cases of hazing.
- Immediately notify security or law enforcement of any suspected hazing incident.

Expect responsibility, integrity and civility:
- Discuss the meaning of the anti-hazing message with the president, student affairs officers, athletic department and athletes.
- Require coaches to screen recruits for behavioral and academic problems.
- Write a policy outlining coaches' and host students' behaviors for overnight recruitment visits.
- Require each coach to meet personally with each student host prior to recruitment visits.
- Make athletes' behavior on and off the field a part of each coach's evaluation.

Offer team-building initiation rites:
- Write a policy on the philosophy and goals of initiation rites in athletics
- Train coaches and athletes on the importance of initiation rites and the ways to conduct them.
- Integrate initiation philosophy and goals into team goal-setting and problem-solving.
- Develop community events for the entire athletic department
- Require organized initiation events for each team prior to each season
- Recognize athletes as leaders in academic, personal, business and community arenas.
- Rely on the Student Athletic Advisory Committee to promote acceptable initiation rites.

APPENDIX I:
EXTENDED QUALITATIVE RESPONSES

The Team-building and Initiation Activities section of the survey read: "There are positive and negative ways to bring new players onto a team. Which of the following activities have you done as part of team-building or initiation for any team on your campus?" A list of initiation activities followed. At the end of the list were three open-ended response items asked athletes to specify other team-building, embarrassing, or dangerous activities. The results of those three open-ended questions are summarized below.

Other team-building activities athletes reported:

Food-related events: banquets, dinners, picnics, barbecues, team lunch tables, breakfast clubs, ice cream runs.

Team gatherings or outings: day trips, overnights, bonfires, clinics, movies, beach trips, camping, wilderness activities, visiting coach's house, off-season conditioning, training camps, biathlons, triathlons, weight lifting, running, recreational sports, ultimate Frisbee, mixers, co-ed workout, scavenger hunts, cheers, chants, songs, hair dyeing, muscle posing, inspirational quotes, devotionals, Bible study groups, charity race, team meetings.

Miscellaneous: trust activities, seminars, workshops, speakers, problem-solving and goal-setting sessions, after-practice discussions, team study halls, mini-Olympics among teams, house-building for Habitat for Humanity, fundraisers, providing security at other sport events, parade float building, secret Santa gift exchange, True Colors (getting to know different personalities), mentoring arrangements for freshmen with upperclassmen, secret buddies, big /little sister or brother programs, player of the week awards, and escorting recruits to lunch and on campus tours.

Other embarrassing activities athletes reported: nudity (streaking, mooning, stripping, skinny dipping, stealing clothing, "elephant walks"); sexual storytelling or jokes; pornography; running in jockstraps, underwear, or diapers; embarrassing singing or dancing; wearing bad make-up in public; writing on or applying gross things to skin; being pushed in a pool, ocean, creek or dirty pond; dumping water in a dorm room; purchasing or carrying embarrassing items; scavenger hunts; going house to house asking for milk; putting a pig's head in a football helmet; urinating in lockers; being forced by administrators to squeeze into a box-sized locker; and "heading" eggs (hitting eggs with their heads), tossed by the coach to the freshmen.

Other dangerous activities athletes reported: various forms of alcohol consumption (chug runs, drink-till-you-puke, shot-gunning); exposure to extreme cold; being buried naked in sand; being given wedgies; being thrown with full gear into a pool; being forced to take steroids and ephedrine; being forced to exercise until they passed out; being forced to inflict pain on oneself; and cruelty to animals.

Many athletes directly challenge attempts to stop hazing. Several student respondents made pleas for compromise; others deny it happens. Both reactions will be major barriers to hazing prevention among athletes. Some comments:

Don't prevent it. Hazing does and should happen as a part of team chemistry. It makes you stronger…builds mental toughness. It is a valuable and important part of both growing up as a person and as a team.… I don't think that any drastic measures need to be taken considering hazing. Most hazing is done out of fun and games. It is not done in order to hurt anyone, only to continue a tradition of respecting the upperclassmen and sharing an experience.… There is not too much hazing at my school and no one objects. I don't think it should be prevented.… What really should happen is that the definition should be loosened and people involved should take it.… Hazing is a common occurrence that brings a team closer together, which you can get in trouble for therefore it is kept quiet. People will haze regardless.… On our team it's doing stupid things like having to sing in front of people, nothing to hurt or endanger our new players. Let it be! … Hazing will never stop. There is always a closed door. It is a horrible thing, but so many kids go through it that they don't know the difference until they are done, and the hazing is finished. Hazing is never going to be completely stopped, so alternatives just to major hazing should be used. For example, less harmful hazing like dressing funny. … If no one is hurt to the point that they need medical attention, just leave it alone. All the kids get accepted when it's over and everyone is done with it. Ninety percent of the time it's a one-time deal and it's over. Leave it alone.

Several athletic directors and coaches directly denied the need to discuss hazing or its prevention. Their comments included:

Athletic Directors: *This is a non-issue! … We don't have a problem with hazing. We have never had an incident at this campus. … Sorry, but this is one of the more ridiculous questionnaires I've ever been asked to complete.*

Coaches: *It's not an issue, it doesn't happen here.… Over the past decade it's never come up at any meeting in student life committee. If it happened, it would be an isolated case.… If it is done, the department doesn't know about it or it's done off campus.… I've never been exposed to any incidents where hazing would have been harmful. I have only heard of football players hazing in my 18 years as a coach on this campus.… Raising it as an issue could create the problem. It's a fraternity and sorority problem, not a NCAA athletics problem, why are you wasting our time?*

Some administrators expressed a concern about not singling out athletes from the rest of the student body. Other administrators and coaches took legalistic approaches, denied their role, or tried to shift the problem to someone else:

Senior Student Affairs Officer: *Please note that the athletic department has no special policies and procedures for hazing. Should this happen, we would follow university policies and procedures. The university, through policies and student affairs regulations, enforces hazing prevention. Problems of and discipline for hazing is handled by upper administration, the same as for all students.*

Athletic Director: *The Greeks are the only ones who haze. Remove houses that promote such behavior.*

Coach: *If a social fraternity or sorority hazing interferes with our practice and/or competitions, I will blackball the organization.*

Everyone agrees that hazing is highly secretive. As one coach put it: "*The rules as they are now are good rules. The problem is that we know hazing occurs but we have no proof. No one will come forward so it is not punished. You can't enforce a rule based on hearsay.*"

Respondents were asked the open-ended question, "What other alternative bonding and recognition activities or other hazing prevention strategies do you consider **most** effective?" The primary themes in their responses are:

- Send a clear message.
- Model standards in personal relationships.
- Provide opportunities to develop a sense of belonging.

Respondents' qualitative responses are presented below, adhering as closely as possible to the language written on their surveys:

Send a Clear Message: Most respondents say that sending a clear message, being specific about what is acceptable and what is not; outlining the consequences of violating the policy, and then truly enforcing the consequences, was primary. *Send a strong message that hazing is not acceptable! No activity dangerous or demeaning to student athletes will be tolerated. The student affairs office needs a code of student conduct that clearly states what constitutes hazing and its consequences.*

Athletic directors and coaches felt that the most effective method was a clear message, a strong department anti-hazing policy, and 100 percent support of the coaching staff to enforce it. Their comments included: *If coaches don't send a clear message, the department policy will fail, so ensure that all staff understand the policy and only hire coaches that concur with it. Hazing and alcohol go hand in hand; make the campus dry or make a second alcohol offense grounds for suspension. Enlist the help of the athletes' council every year to monitor and discourage hazing. Have an anti-hazing contract all student athletes must sign with very clear, strict consequences. Discuss hazing annually at the NCAA Eligibility Meeting—every athlete must attend—and clearly outline all definitions, expectations, and consequences. Follow up in team meetings at pre-season, mid-season, and post-season to assess athletic and non-athletic short- and long-term goals that include no hazing. Have speakers with real-life experience talk to athletes. Require an education series for all athletes and have alcohol and hazing awareness programs integrated throughout the campus.* Coaches added: *strictly maintain the rule to conduct oneself as a gentleman both on and off the campus. Simply don't tolerate poor behavior and hold coaches accountable for not allowing any form of hazing to go on!*

Many coaches and athletes added a concern about educating athletes on what hazing is and why it is wrong in a real-life way with details and descriptions, even requiring team members to give talks to high school athletes.

Good definitional work is not easy. Hazing means many different things to different people. One athletic director said: "*Meet with your athletes, explain the good and bad about hazing.*" Did he mean explain the good and bad about initiation? Or did he really believe that humiliating or endangering a team member can be good sometimes and bad sometimes? A fuller understanding of respondents' perceptions requires qualitative study.

Make it safe for people—athletes and recruits—to report hazing, then take action. One athletic director commented: "*I threaten the seniors with not playing in the first game if there is ANY hazing—so far, so good.*" Athletic directors and coaches commonly mentioned athletic consequences: *if the whole team is involved, forfeit the next game; if individuals are involved, remove them from the*

team, revoke their scholarships, suspend them from school, file a police report. One athletic director recommended stages: *1st offense is suspension for a game, 2nd offense off the team for a year, 3rd offense off team forever.* Coaches said to hold the head coach responsible for any hazing activity. Some students were the toughest, making comments such as: *"Report all fights, hazing, drinking and general misconduct to the student affairs office."* and *"If you want to stop hazing, file a police report for any misconduct."*

Enforcing a clear message hides a raft of problems. Students want to make their own choices, although their experience in decision-making prior to college varies widely. Learning to make choices and suffering the consequences is a right that students want to enjoy if not demand.

> *Let people choose for themselves…. Hazing is a choice. You don't have to get involved if it's dangerous…. Hazing occurs on our campus but it is not a problem; if people do not want to participate or participate and not drink there are no consequences…. We have group activities with alcohol and underage drinking but if one chooses not to drink, their choice is respected…. Every team has different traditions and as long as players are able to decline involvement there's nothing wrong with it…. Most coaches know about initiations, but they know it brings their teams closer together…. You know what you're getting into. If you don't want to deal with it you don't have to—get off the team…. People have a choice. The players can make their own decisions.*

Athletes apparently apply their right to make choices to their right to test the limits in hazing, without realizing the unique conditions of hazing, which occurs in an environment of significant peer pressure at a vulnerable time for new members who have a great deal to lose by not complying. It is typically designed without adult guidance by youth, who know little about the dynamics driving them. The definition of hazing, in these circumstances, "expected of someone joining a group" and "regardless of the person's willingness to participate," is hard for both students and adults to understand and accept.

In spite of all the difficulties in addressing athletic hazing, some athletic directors and coaches believe there is no choice other than to meet hazing head-on. As one athletic director said: *Hazing is a vicious cycle. Those who accept the extremes of poor behavior by others can't wait till their turn to get their pound of flesh. The harder it is to get into a group, the harder it is to get out. We have clear standards of conduct for student-athletes; "hazing" needs to be specifically identified.*

Expect Responsibility, Integrity, and Civility. For athletes, coaches, and athletic directors, nowhere was the message more apparent than in the standards and relationships established in recruitment. Coaches recommended high school visits and not recruiting trouble or anyone with a troubled history. Students made comments such as: *"Establish expectations of character and recruit within them."* and *"If the standard is set and expected, people tend to live up to those expectations."*

All groups believe that solid personal relationships at every level – between players and coaches, coaches and athletic departments, athletic departments and student affairs, and administrators and the president – are all key to preventing hazing. *"Good communication at each link helps catch behaviors in one arena that might signal trouble in another arena. Student affairs deals with student conduct individually, the athletic department needs to deal with team conduct; both need to work together."* One coach added: *"Alumni must buy into the no-hazing policy and stop the 'when I was in school…' as each class tries to top the previous. You stop it for four years and it will stop for good. Tradition is a strong motivator both positive and negative."*

Still, the most important factor is the awareness, concern and role modeling of coaches and team captains, and the support they get from their department to create an environment with safety, leadership, trust, and respect. A coach stated: *"The key to preventing hazing is coach leadership with clear, strong follow-up messages by the athletic administration and the college student affairs administration."* An athlete commented: *"Every coach knows what happens on the team. If a coach claims otherwise, he or she is denying the truth. The best way to eliminate or reduce hazing is to encourage the coach to crack down on those who do it."*

Coaches and athletes add a concern for the relationships between upper- and underclassmen in which they actively share and explore a wide range of issues concerning life skills, substance abuse, and so forth. A coach found that more and more student athletes every year find a genuine interest in this type of program. One athlete suggested that the bigger the team, the less the athletes know each other, the more hazing occurs. *"Maintain a good, active student athletic committee (with by-laws and regular meetings) that represents all teams and has open discussions on hazing. For many people, religion is a great preventative: 'Love thy neighbor as thyself.' The concept is simple, everyone deserves to be loved and respected."* Still, contrary to the common theme of relationship building, one athletic director suggested: *"No separate dorms for teams, no problems."*

Offer Team-building Initiation Rites. Acceptable initiation and team-building activities require a clear, common understanding on the part of coaches and administration about what exactly is positive, developmentally important, and acceptable. Student affairs officers promote a wide range of university-sponsored initiation and team-building activities. They are, however, the only ones to suggest openly that *"some leeway for marginally inappropriate behavior should be granted."* One student affairs officer thought that athletes need leeway to have *"a race and fountain dive in winter wearing their underwear."* Another student affairs officer thought that *"carrying an object"* is fine for initiation. The definitional problem arises again.

Athletic directors are consistent: "W*hile enforcing athletic anti-hazing policies, colleges need to encourage alternative team-building and bonding activities with athletes to put our resources where our mouth is."* The list of alternative activities is extensive. As a student affairs officer summarized it: *"The key is to do all of these items every year with every team."* The key is a lot of organization, consistency, preparation, and follow-through. One athletic director said: *"We have attempted to build a strong athletic family atmosphere. A 'welcome back' September barbecue, a strong student-athlete advisory council, seminars, workshops, peer education, workshop series for leadership, alcohol, drug, gambling, stress management, etc."* Coaches noted how important it is to work very hard at team-building activities, guide athletes toward appropriate and acceptable activities, and then remove people for inappropriate behavior. One coach reminded us of the team-building effect of good, hard, sports itself: *"We work and practice hard to win games, with team goal- setting and problem-solving; that always brings teams together."* Although most coaches made numerous suggestions for acceptable initiation activities, one coach remarked that: *"Through practice, travel and competition, players develop a bond; other attempts are artificial and may create relationships contrary to the purpose of practice, training and competition."* Students, however, felt it was very important to spend time together in a relaxed, non-competitive environment doing activities that don't include violence, just positive fun stuff, with coaches and students from freshmen to seniors. Athletes also suggested having team outings on the nights when the most "partying" would occur.

Each respondent group, except athletic directors, discusses the need for recognition and affirmation. They suggest: a*nnual awards or rotating awards to teams and individuals for academic achievement, community service, character, or sportsmanship that appear in the university and local newspapers and are recognized by the president, deans, or even student body, parents, and alumni.* An athletic director notes: *"We recognize an all-academic team of varsity athletes who are academic high*

achievers." A coach comments: *"We do a senior recognition night early in the season when underclassmen can roast and show their appreciation to each senior. It gives seniors status early and promotes their positive attitude toward the younger players."* An athlete reports: *"When we go on long road trips we tape a bag onto the backs of each person's seat with their names on it. Each teammate writes something they admire about their abilities or a positive contribution they have made to the team on a note card to place in each team member's bag. It's great for confidence."*

APPENDIX II:
DATA TABLES ON ATHLETES MOST AT RISK

At a confidence level of 99 percent, athletes most at risk of being subjected to any kind of hazing for athletics were:

- Male (p=.0009)
- Non-Greek (p=.0012)
- Swimmers or divers (p=.00001)
- Soccer players (p=.0083)
- Lacrosse players (p=.0016)
- In the east or south (p=.0017)
- On a rural campus (p=.0016)
- On a residential campus (p=.0014)
- On a campus with a Greek system (p=.0113)
- In a state with no anti-hazing law (p=.0139).

Although a Greek system on campus is a significant predictor of hazing, it is particularly non-Greeks, however, who are most likely to be involved with athletic hazing.

Profile of Athletes Who Were Hazed and Profile of Their Campuses

Gender	%	#
Male	62	155,781
Female	38	96,860

Greek	%	#
Member	11	27,354
Not Member	89	224,261

Region	%	#
East/NE	41	95,153
South	20	47,025
Midwest	20	46,986
West	19	43,848

Residential	%	#
Residential	85	205,998
Commuter	15	34,978

On Athletic Scholarship	%	#
Yes	36	91,154
No	64	160,799

NCAA Div.	%	#
Division I	41	104,052
Division II	22	55,501
Division III	37	93,088

Location	%	#
Urban	32	72,984
Suburban	36	83,678
Rural	32	74,890

Greek System	%	#
Yes	74	184,304
No	26	63,967

Ethnicity	%	#
Caucasian	90	226,254
African-Am.	5	11,516
Other	5	13,752

State Law In Place	%	#
Yes	92	209,346
No	8	18,067

Type	%	#
Public	41	97,432
Private	59	141,356

When viewing specific groups of athletes, however, we find the picture is somewhat more complex. Using the four groups of athletes defined based on the general severity of their activities, the following tables provide profiles of athletes in each of the four groups:

- Acceptable Initiation Activities Only
- Questionable Initiation Activities, not clearly unacceptable
- Alcohol-related Initiation Activities, not otherwise unacceptable
- Unacceptable Initiation Activities, other than alcohol-related

Unacceptable Initiation. At a confidence level of 99 percent, athletes most at risk of being subjected to clearly unacceptable and potentially illegal initiation activities, regardless of the involvement of alcohol, are:

- Male (p=.0001)
- Swimmers or divers (p=.0001)
- Football players (p=.005)
- Water polo players (p=.024) *(98% confidence level)*
- In the south or mid-west (p=.009)

Profile of Athletes Subjected to Unacceptable Initiation and Profile of Their Campuses

Gender	%	#
Male	74	50,465
Female	26	17,577

Greek	%	#
Member	12	8,340
Not Member	88	59,533

On Athletic Scholarship	%	#
Yes	39	26,714
No	61	41,103

NCAA Div.	%	#
Division I	42	29,033
Division II	23	15,279
Division III	35	23,729

Ethnicity	%	#
Caucasian	92	62,858
African-Am.	3	2,121
Other	4	2,944

Region	%	#
East/NE	36	23,041
South	26	16,550
Midwest	26	16,400
West	12	8,031

Location	%	#
Urban	31	19,117
Suburban	39	23,896
Rural	30	18,650

State Law In Place	%	#
Yes	92	57,352
No	8	5,099

Residential	%	#
Residential	83	53,890
Commuter	17	11,373

Greek System	%	#
Yes	76	50,143
No	24	16,020

Type	%	#
Public	45	28,962
Private	55	34,878

Alcohol-Related Initiation. At a confidence level of 99 percent, athletes most at risk of being subjected to alcohol-related initiation, but not other unacceptable and potentially illegal initiation activities, were:

- Female (p=.0001)
- Lacrosse players (p=.001)
- In the east or west (p=.0001)
- On residential campuses (p=.0001)

Profile of Athletes Subjected to Alcohol-Related Initiation and Profile of Their Campus

Gender	%	#
Male	60	95,557
Female	40	63,266

Greek	%	#
Member	12	18,264
Not Member	88	140,031

On Athletic Scholarship	%	#
Yes	35	55,983
No	65	102,693

NCAA Div.	%	#
Division I	43	68,003
Division II	20	31,841
Division III	37	58,978

Ethnicity	%	#
Caucasian	94	148,542
African-Am.	3	4,051
Other	3	5,651

Region	%	#
East/NE	43	63,020
South	18	26,222
Midwest	22	32,899
West	17	25,149

Location	%	#
Urban	32	45,770
Suburban	35	51,316
Rural	33	48,334

State Law In Place	%	#
Anti-hazing	93	132,232
No anti-hazing	7	10,711

Residential	%	#
Residential	87	131,828
Commuter	13	20,118

Greek System	%	#
Yes	76	118,260
No	24	38,231

Type	%	#
Public	40	60,803
Private	60	89,679

Questionable Initiation. At a confidence level of 96 percent, athletes most at risk of being subjected to questionable, but not unacceptable, initiation activities were: football players (p=.001) in the south or west (p=.0001).

Profile of Athletes Subjected to Questionable Initiation and Profile of Their Campuses

Gender	%	#
Male	63	135,046
Female	37	80,792

Greek	%	#
Member	10	22,288
Not Member	90	192,736

On Athletic Scholarship	%	#
Yes	37	79,268
No	63	135,882

NCAA Div.	%	#
Division I	41	88,545
Division II	22	48,421
Division III	37	78,873

Ethnicity	%	#
Caucasian	89	191,653
African-Am.	5	10,637
Other	6	12,428

Region	%	#
East/NE	41	81,736
South	21	41,520
Midwest	20	39,286
West	18	35,831

Location	%	#
Urban	32	62,390
Suburban	37	72,754
Rural	32	62,801

State Law In Place	%	#
Anti-hazing	92	179,155
No anti-hazing	8	15,534

Residential	%	#
Residential	85	175,417
Commuter	15	30,597

Greek System	%	#
Yes	74	157,370
No	26	54,286

Type	%	#
Public	41	83,002
Private	59	120,471

Acceptable Initiation. At a confidence level of 99 percent, athletes most apt to be involved in only acceptable initiation were:

- Female (p=.014)
- Greek members (p=.001)
- Track (p=.009)
- Fencing (p=.014)
- Tennis players (p=.038) *(97% confidence level)*
- In the mid-west or west (p=.039) *(97% confidence level)*
- On commuter campuses (p=.002)
- On urban campuses (p=.043) *(96% confidence level)*

Profile of Athletes Involved in Only Acceptable Initiation and Profile of Their Campuses

Gender	%	#
Male	56	34,707
Female	44	27,180

On Athletic Scholarship	%	#
Yes	36	22,070
No	64	39,817

Ethnicity	%	#
Caucasian	90	54,906
African-Am.	4	2,640
Other	6	3,099

Greek	%	#
Member	17	10,558
Not Member	83	51,023

NCAA Div.	%	#
Division I	42	25,935
Division II	19	11,598
Division III	39	24,355

Region	%	#
East/NE	32	17,645
South	20	11,060
Midwest	28	15,133
West	20	11,109

Location	%	#
Urban	37	19,950
Suburban	34	18,445
Rural	29	15,927

State Law In Place	%	#
Anti-hazing	93	50,486
No anti-hazing	7	3,714

Residential	%	#
Residential	81	46,356
Commuter	19	11,018

Greek System	%	#
Yes	73	44,941
No	27	16,286

Type	%	#
Public	38	21,712
Private	62	35,395

When the use of alcohol, either during recruitment or later in a drinking contest, is considered the dominant factor, the picture shifts again.

Alcohol on Recruitment. At a confidence level of 99 percent, athletes most at risk of consuming alcohol on recruitment were:

- On athletic scholarship (p=.0001)
- NCAA Division I (p=.0001)
- Swimmers or divers (p=.0001)
- Lacrosse players (p=.0001))
- Football players (p=.0001)
- Soccer players (p=.013)
- In the east (p=.017)
- On rural (p=.005), residential campuses (p=.0001)
- In a state with an anti-hazing law (p=.0001)

Profile of NCAA Athletes Consuming Alcohol on Recruitment Visits and Profile of Their Campuses

Gender	%	#
Male	62	83,956
Female	38	52,205

On Athletic Scholarship	%	#
Yes	42	57,596
No	58	78,194

Ethnicity	%	#
Caucasian	93	125,478
African-Am.	3	4,129
Other	4	5,973

Greek	%	#
Member	14	18,765
Not Member	86	117,227

NCAA Div.	%	#
Division I	47	64,285
Division II	20	26,785
Division III	33	45,091

Region	%	#
East/NE	43	55,040
South	20	24,855
Midwest	21	26,932
West	16	20,200

Location	%	#
Urban	30	37,218
Suburban	34	41,760
Rural	36	44,257

State Law In Place	%	#
Anti-hazing	93	113,977
No anti-hazing	7	8,822

Residential	%	#
Residential	87	113,051
Commuter	13	16,359

Greek System	%	#
Yes	80	107,463
No	20	27,112

Type	%	#
Public	42	53,282
Private	58	74,664

Drinking Contests for Athletic Team Initiation. At a confidence level of 99 percent, athletes most at risk of being subjected to drinking contests for athletic team initiation were:

- Swimmers or divers (p=.0001)
- Lacrosse players (p=.0001))
- Hockey players (p=.039) *(97% confidence level)*
- In the east (p=.0001)
- On rural campuses (p=.032) *(97% confidence level)*
- On residential campuses (p=.0001)
- In a state with no anti-hazing law (p=.026)

Profile of Athletes Participating in Drinking Contests for Initiation and Profile of Their Campuses

Gender	%	#
Male	61	66,528
Female	39	42,992

Greek	%	#
Member	11	12,374
Not Member	89	96,859

On Athletic Scholarship	%	#
Yes	38	40,961
No	62	68,189

NCAA Div.	%	#
Division I	38	41,361
Division II	25	27,324
Division III	37	40,835

Ethnicity	%	#
Caucasian	94	102,390
African-Am.	2	1,700
Other	4	5,018

Region	%	#
East/NE	47	48,214
South	16	16,251
Midwest	19	19,528
West	18	17,896

Location	%	#
Urban	32	31,920
Suburban	32	31,350
Rural	36	35,662

State Law In Place	%	#
Anti-hazing	91	90,262
No anti-hazing	9	9,436

Residential	%	#
Residential	88	91,560
Commuter	12	12,888

Greek System	%	#
Yes	75	80,317
No	25	27,444

Type	%	#
Public	41	42,269
Private	59	60,044

APPENDIX III:
METHODOLOGY

The study used two survey instruments: one for student athletes and one for coaches and administrators. The surveys were mailed directly to all respondents. The survey returned a standard response rate of 23% on the average over all respondents: student athletes, coaches, and administrators. The surveys were optically scanned at National Computer Systems, Inc., and the database transferred onto a secure server at Alfred University.

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Two survey instruments were developed: for student athletes and for senior administrators and coaches. The surveys were nearly identical, with editorial changes appropriate to the respondents and with minor differences in selected questions. Each survey includes four sections:

- **Background**: This section included questions on the demographic background of the individual and the campus, including participation in Greek social organizations, sports coached or played, and whether the campus is in a state with an anti-hazing law.

- **Hazing**: This section opened with a definition of hazing given for respondents to use in answering the questions: *Hazing is any activity expected of someone joining a group that humiliates, degrades, abuses, or endangers, regardless of the person's willingness to participate. This does not include activities such as: rookies carrying the balls, team parties with community games, or going out with your teammates, unless an atmosphere of humiliation, degradation, abuse, or danger arises.* Respondents were asked a number of questions: the attitude of the athletic department towards hazing, if they had ever been involved in hazing, and how pervasive they felt hazing is on campus. They were also asked whether they would report hazing, and, if not, why.

- **Team-building and Initiation Activities**: Student athletes were asked if they were involved in or suspected any of twenty-four specific initiation activities. Administrators were asked if they have known about or suspected any of these same activities. All respondents were asked if they thought that the activities were traditional, required, appropriate, inappropriate, or done when drinking alcohol.

- **Strategies for Preventing Hazing**: Respondents were asked if any of 11 specific hazing prevention strategies were used on their campus and how effective they rated each of these strategies. An open-ended question requested suggestions for alternative bonding and recognition activities or hazing prevention strategies considered most effective.

RESPONDENTS

The NCAA provided the names and addresses of the athletic directors, senior women's administrators, and their National Student Athlete Advisory Committee members. Higher Education Publications, Inc., provided the names and addresses of the senior student affairs officers from their *1999 Higher Education Directory*. *Collegiate Directories, Inc.* provided a national random sample of coaches of NCAA sports teams. Presidents of all NCAA institutions were invited to join in this study by providing a contact person from whom to obtain the names and addresses of student athletes on their campus. Although the letter went out at a difficult time of year – early December 1998– nearly

one-fourth of all NCAA institutions (224) provided athletes' names and addresses by the deadline of January 20, 1999. An additional 120 institutions wished to participate but were not able to provide student names and addresses by the given deadline.

The survey reflected the full range of institutions across the nation, from large public universities to small private colleges. The distribution of NCAA institutions that provided student athlete names and addresses paralleled the national distribution of all NCAA institutions across all three NCAA divisions. Southern Division I participation was slightly lower than the national percentage and Eastern Division III participation was slightly higher.

Distribution of All NCAA Institutions

Region	Division I	Division II	Division III	Total
Eastern	7%	6%	21%	34%
Midwestern	5%	5%	9%	19%
Southern	12%	11%	6%	29%
Western	6%	7%	5%	18%
Total	30%	29%	41%	100%

Distribution of Participating Institutions

Region	Division I	Division II	Division III	Total
Eastern	6%	5%	26%	37%
Midwestern	5%	4%	9%	18%
Southern	8%	13%	8%	29%
Western	6%	5%	5%	16%
Total	25%	27%	48%	100%

The 224 institutions submitted the names of 61,258 male and female students. A national random sample of 10,000 student athletes was taken from this pool. Each selected athlete was mailed a survey form and a no-postage-necessary, business reply envelope. Only one mailing went out to ensure no duplication in the respondents. Anonymous direct mail was critical to this study since many people hesitate to report experiences they think will reflect badly on them, their team, or their school. Surveys were mailed January 26-29, 1999, to the groups listed below.

Respondent Groups, Number of Each Group Surveyed, Number of Surveys Returned, and Response Rate Per Group

Respondents	# Sent	#Returned
All NCAA Athletic Directors	1,014	304 / 30%
All VPs or Dean of Student Affairs for institutions	1,034	228 / 22%
All NCAA Student Athlete Advisory Committee members	86	27 / 31%
All NCAA Senior Women's Administrators	234	
Random sample of all NCAA coaches	3,000	939 / 29%
Random sample of student athletes from 223 NCAA institutions	10,000	2,009 / 20%
Total surveys	15,368	3,507 / 23%

Response Rates and Distribution of Student Athletes

Response rates shown above were respectable at 20% - 31%. The student response rate of 20% was quite high given that students move frequently, many surveys were returned, and more were certainly undelivered. The response rate from senior student affairs officers at 22% was standard for direct mail surveys. Response rates from athletic directors and NCAA National Student Athlete Advisory Committee members were high at 30% and 31% respectively.

The response rates for coaches and senior women's administrators were merged. Surveys were sent to all 234 senior women's administrators registered with the NCAA and to a national random sample of 3,000 coaches. The response from senior women's administrators was 204 and from coaches was 735. We assume that many of the coaches identified themselves as senior women's administrators, but were not necessarily registered with the NCAA as such. Because of this we merged these two groups. This added 10% non-random selection of 234 names to the random sample of coaches. Descriptive results were still of interest. Of the two groups combined, the 29% response rate was high.

The student athlete sample was large enough to contain a strong representation of both gender and NCAA division. Response rates for men and women, however, were inverted: men composed 43% of the respondents as opposed to 61% of the population of student athletes, and women composed 57% of the respondents as opposed to 39% of the population of student athletes. Response rates were also inverted for Division I and Division III: Division I comprised 29% of the respondents as opposed to 42% of the population of student athletes, and Division III comprised 49% of the respondents as opposed to 37% of the population of student athletes. These inversions were taken into account throughout the analysis.

Total Number of NCAA Registered Athletes and % of Total Athletes Compared to Total Number of Respondents & % of Total Respondents by NCAA Division & Gender

Division	Male	Female	Total	Percent	Male	Female	Total	Percent
I	84507	52154	136661	42%	219	351	570	29%
II	43713	26162	69875	21%	195	221	416	22%
III	72407	49893	122300	37%	425	525	950	49%
Total	200627	128209	328836		839	1097	1936	
	61%	39%			43%	57%		

Student athlete response rates by sport generally matched the distribution of athletes across sports. Many institutions noted that they did not include the track team in the January 20th submission deadline for the survey, since it's a spring sport. We knew representation in track would be low. Football and cross-country were the only fall sports for which the response rate was lower than their proportional share. This low response rate calls into question a response bias for football and cross country teams. As secretive as hazing can be, underreporting is a real concern and possibility. The response rate for swimming was quite high. Soccer was also somewhat high.

Total Number of NCAA Registered Athletes and % of Total Athletes Compared to Total Number of Respondents and % of Total Respondents By NCAA Sport and Gender

	Population:				Sample:			
Sport	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Percent**	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Percent**
Baseball	24442	0	24442	7.56%	121	0	121	5.42%
Basketball	15141	13392	28533	8.83%	55	119	174	7.79%
Cross Country	10271	10141	20412	6.32%	101	101	202	9.04%
Fencing	657	558	1215	0.38%	3	4	7	0.31%
Football	53984	0	53984	16.70%	208	0	208	9.31%
Golf	7197	2323	9520	2.95%	46	29	75	3.36%
Gymnastics	413	1311	1724	0.53%	0	14	14	0.63%
Ice Hockey	3608	436	4044	1.25%	12	11	23	1.03%
Lacrosse	5705	4068	9773	3.02%	32	47	79	3.54%
Rifle	408	0	408	0.13%	2	0	2	0.09%
Rowing	1820	3951	5771	1.79%	12	54	66	2.95%
Skiing	575	455	1030	0.32%	4	12	16	0.72%
Soccer	17053	14829	31882	9.87%	105	180	285	12.76%
Softball	0	13167	13167	4.07%	0	146	146	6.54%
Swimming	7508	8745	16253	5.03%	66	124	190	8.59%
Tennis	7999	8223	16222	5.02%	30	73	104	4.66%
Track	35262	28639	63901	19.76%	153	51	302	13.52%
Volleyball	1052	12284	13336	4.13%	5	160	165	7.36%
Water Polo	893	452	1345	0.42%	7	11	18	0.81%
Wrestling	6219	0	6219	1.92%	37	0	37	1.66%
TOTALS	200207	122974	323181	100.00%	719	893	2234	100.00%

Note: This table does not include squash players, since there were none in the survey, which brings the population below the NCAA national estimate of 328,836. Respondents were asked to check all sports that apply, bringing the total above the sample size of 2,076.

Data Collection and Handling

Surveys were mailed directly to student athletes' homes and to administrators' place of work on January 26-29, 1999. Surveys were returned to Alfred University in self-addressed, stamped business envelopes. Returns were due postmarked by February 28, 1999. One week after the deadline, on March 5, 1999, all surveys were boxed and mailed to National Computer Systems, Inc (NCS) for optical scanning. To ensure anonymity, no unique identifier was printed on the surveys. Therefore, NCS printed identifier codes on page one and two of each survey to ensure matching once page one and two were separated for scanning. Qualitative responses were entered by hand. The final database including all respondents was transferred to a secure server at Alfred University.

Statistical Analyses

Initially, frequency tables were analyzed for each respondent group of students and staff by the entire group and by each demographic variable. A cross-tab of gender and NCAA Division was used to develop sample weights. Each of the six groups of males and females by NCAA Division I, Division II and Division III was weighted by the sample frequency divided by the population to produce synthetic estimations of prevalence.

Factor analysis is a statistical tool used to identify unobservable qualities, i.e. types of people, using a set of observable activities, i.e. initiation rites. The basic assumption of factor analysis is that these unobservable qualities can explain complex phenomena; observed correlation between activities results from the observed activities sharing these qualities. Another assumption is that interpreting the quality of each factor yields new insights and understanding into the relationships between the activities. For instance, the first principal component or factor accounts for the largest amount of variance in the sample. The second accounts for the next largest, and so forth. For the purposes of these analyses, if the relationship of a variable to the factor was .3 or higher (the statistical rule of thumb for factor analysis), it was considered to be highly correlated with the factor.

The results of the factor analysis in the order of how they loaded on the factor analysis are reported below. If the relationship of a variable to the factor was .3 or higher, it was considered to be highly correlated with the factor at 97% confidence.

Group 1: Victims were forced to:

- Associate with only certain people (.750)
- Destroy or steal property (.750)
- Act as a personal servant to others off the field (.712)
- Be tied up, taped, or confined in small space (.690)
- Be paddled, whipped, beaten, kicked, or beat up others (.580)
- Participate in calisthenics not related to sport (.505)
- Do other embarrassing, painful, or dangerous acts (.351 & .542)

They significantly DO NOT: wear embarrassing clothing (-.830), tattoo, pierce, shave heads, or brand (-.382), or engage in or simulate sexual acts (-.351).

Group 2: Victims were forced to:

- Do other embarrassing, painful, or dangerous acts (.709 & .653)
- Be kidnapped or transported and abandoned (.640)
- Be tied up, taped, or confined in small spaces (.617)
- Be yelled, cursed, sworn at (.486)

- Be paddled, whipped, beaten, kicked, or beat up others (.476)
- Wear embarrassing clothing (.392)
- Consume spicy or disgusting concoctions (.361)

They significantly DO NOT: associate with only certain people (-.530), destroy or steal property (-.530), or make prank calls or harass others (-.344).

Group 3: Victims were forced to:

- Deprive themselves of sleep, food, or hygiene (.926)
- Make prank calls or harass others (.747)
- Engage in or simulate sexual acts (.619)
- Act as personal servants to others off the field (.426)
- Do other embarrassing activities (.327)

They significantly DO NOT: tattoo, pierce, shave heads or brand (-.464), participate in drinking contests (-.428), get kidnapped or transported and abandoned (-.355), or paddle, whip, beat, kick or beat up others (-.303).

Group 4: Victims were forced to:

- Consume spicy or disgusting concoctions (.655)
- Participate in drinking contests (.592)
- Be paddled, whipped, beaten, kicked, or beat up others (.563)
- Be yelled, cursed, or sworn at (.449)
- Be kidnapped or transported and abandoned (.423)
- Be tattooed, pierced, branded or shave their heads (.405)
- Destroy or steal property (.358)
- Associate with only certain people (.358)

They significantly DO NOT do other painful or dangerous activities (.390)

Group 5: Victims were forced to:

- Consume alcohol on recruitment (.858)
- Be tattooed, pierced, branded or shave their heads (.433)

They significantly DO NOT: participate in calisthenics not related to sport (-.734); be yelled at, cursed or sworn at (-.415), consume spicy or disgusting concoctions (-.389)

Group 6: Victims were forced to:

- Participate in drinking contests (.514)
- Engage in or simulate sexual acts (.441)
- Do other embarrassing acts (.412)

They significantly DO NOT: tattoo, pierce, shave, or brand (-.389), undergo being tied up, taped, or confined in small spaces (-.333), or make prank calls or harass others (-.321).

A factor analysis was run on all team-building and initiation activities among athletes to determine factors, or groups of activities statistically related to one another. We anticipated three groups: athletes involved in acceptable, humiliating and dangerous activities. Statistically, however, only two groups arose: acceptable and unacceptable. Humiliating and dangerous activities frequently occur together for most students. We then created four new variables reflecting athletes who participated in (1) one, (2) two, (3) three or four, and (4) five or more negative activities. For those involved in one negative activity, frequencies were run; two, cross-tabs; three to four, non-parametric correlation; five or more, factor analysis. Using alcohol while participating in initiation activities was quite frequent, therefore a variable was created to identify participation in any activity (positive or negative) while using alcohol. Based on theory and interest, three additional variables were created to identify participation in any (1) humiliating, (2) dangerous and (3) illegal activity.

The three humiliating activities with the highest frequency of participation are (1) tattooing, piercing or shaving, (2) being yelled, cursed, or sworn at, and (3) wearing embarrassing clothes. New variables were made to explore the relationship between these frequent humiliating activities and the dangerous activities. These new variables isolate those who participated in a highly frequent humiliating activity without participation in any dangerous activities. The characteristics of these unique people were explored further using descriptive statistics, factor analysis and non-parametric correlation.

To compare different groups of respondents, three other variables were made. One variable compared team sports to individual sports. The other two compared those who perceived being hazed in a group versus on a team, and those who perceived being hazed versus hazing others. For perception variables, respondents were provided a definition of hazing and asked yes/no questions regarding their perception of being hazed or hazing others. Team-building and initiation variables described above involved yes/no questions concerning actual participation in a particular activity. Once the new variables were made, non-parametric correlation was conducted on the actual activities with demographic variables and prevention strategies used by the athletic department. This was done to identify significant relationships between the activities and variables of interest for further analysis.

To further investigate significant group differences, cross-tabular analyses using the chi-square statistic were conducted. Demographic groups were crossed with activities to identify at-risk groups and hot spots, while the perceived hazing variables were crossed with variables to validate perceived versus actual hazing. Group variables, including team versus individual sports, group versus team hazing, and hazed versus hazing others, were crossed with demographic variables to identify group differences. Gender was crossed with all variables to identify male and female differences. Age and class variables were crossed with age of hazing involvement to identify generational trends.

The most complex analyses used were logistic and multiple regression. In addition to the cross-tabular results of comparing participation in activities with demographic characteristics, regression was used on the scaled frequency of activity variables to identify at-risk groups and hot spots. Logistic regression was used to identify which prevention strategies predict participation in positive activities and non-participation in negative activities.

Limitations of the Data

Because of the secrecy around hazing activities, we guaranteed complete anonymity by conducting a direct-mail survey. This restricted any comparative analysis of athletes, coaches, and administrators from the same institution.

Although we were able to survey student athletes in all 223 participating NCAA institutions, it is possible that some of the worst hazing caused some athletes to drop out of collegiate athletics. It is not possible from a study of athletes to determine how significant a group that might be.

The complexity of activities made it very difficult to structure a survey easy enough to fill out so that respondents would take the time to do it and would complete it as accurately as possible. During analysis it became evident that respondents reported changeable demographics – age, class, grade point average – of the current time, not the time at which hazing occurred. This restricted our ability to make inferences about these variables.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Initiation Rites and Athletics: A National Survey of NCAA Sports Teams: Final Report

Author(s): Nadine Hoover

Corporate Source: Alfred University

Publication Date: August '99

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑

[X]

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑

[ ]

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑

[ ]

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Susan Goebelius	Printed Name/Position/Title: Susan C. Goebelius, director of communications
Organization/Address: Alfred University, One Saxon Drive, Alfred, NY 14802	Telephone: 607 871 2170 FAX: 607 871 2373
	E-Mail Address: goebelius@alfred.edu Date: 1/24/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
~~1787 Agate Street~~
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)